



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,251	12/28/2001	Manolito E. Adan	003797.00207	6178

28319 7590 01/16/2004

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,251

Applicant(s)

ADAN ET AL

Examiner

Abbas I Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson (5727155) in view of Braden Harder et al. (USPN 5933822).

Regarding claims 1 and 17, Dawson teaches a host system (200) including its display device (340) as well as a remote system (220) including its own display device (375), and remote application (360), which maintains a list of display locations belonging to shared applications. See Fig. 3 & col. 6, lines 33-41. Dawson teaches a host system (300) providing different levels of access to the remote system. Furthermore, Dawson teaches access provided to the remote system as being "unlocked" which enables the remote system user to perform modifications and subsequent transmissions to the host system (200). See col. 8, lines 34-42. However, Dawson does not teach forming a query at the remote device such that execution of a query is to cause an application associated with an event to be launched by the host computer. Braden-Harder

Art Unit: 2674

(hereafter referred as Braden) teaches as shown in Fig. 2 that a user enters a query (201) to the browser, which in turn sends the query via system (300) and through the Internet connection to server (220), to search engine (225). Braden adds that the search engine processes the query and returns its result back to web browser (420). See col. 8, lines 56-67, col. 9, lines 1-13 and Fig. 3

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dawson's remote-host computer system to adapt the use of query and a search engine (225) shown in Fig. 2. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Braden that the system as shown in Fig. 2 including the use of query and a search engine (225) equivalently provide the desired execution of a query and launching of an application by the host computer. The use of a query and search engine (225) helps function a client-server system as taught by Braden.

Regarding claim 17, in addition to what has been described above, Braden teaches a client computer within retrieval system (200) (Fig. 2) including user input device (390), (keyboard, mouse), input interfaces (330) and output interfaces (360). Braden teaches a user supplying the engine with a keyword-based query, and the engine searching through its database to locate documents that contain at least one word that matches the query. Braden teaches that upon requesting, the operator engine retrieves the document record for each document as shown on retrieval process (600), which includes execution (Fig. 6A-6B). See col. 2, lines 11-30

Regarding claims 2, 4 and 7, referring Fig. 2, Dawson teaches that a remote system (220), which may be executing multiple applications displayed on visual display (230). It would have been obvious that the applications can be an event representing receipt of a message and a calendar message.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 6, Dawson teaches a visual display device with a wide variety of applications that include any programs. It would have been obvious that that the programs can include audio signal production.

Regarding claims 3, 5, 14 and 18-19, referring Fig. 2, Dawson teaches a host system including a visual display device (205) and a remote system (220) including visual display devices (225).

Regarding claims 8-13, 16 and 20-25, Dawson teaches remote system (220) including a display (225) that contains 'N' applications displayed as shown In Fig. 2. Dawson also teaches applications appearing on a display device (225) of the remote system, and further teaches that all mouse and keyboard activities "on the shared applications' are entered by the user of remote system. See col. 15, lines 38-47. It would have been obvious to utilize the keyboard for the desired actuations of the buttons. It would have been obvious the application of the host system can be an Internet browser, messaging application or any other applications.

Regarding claim 26, Braden teaches that the search engine processes the query and returns its result back to web browser (420).

Regarding claims 27-28, Dawson teaches the flow of information from remote system to host system and vise versa. See Fig. 3.

Regarding claims 15 and 29, Braden teaches application programs (400) that execute within a computer (300). See Fig. (3-4).

Regarding claim 30, Braden teaches a client personal computer comprising input interfaces (INPUT I/F) 330, and output interfaces (OUTPUT I/F) 360. See Fig. 3.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 31, Braden discloses a retrieval system including a query (201) entered by a user to the browser and discloses a web address, (URL). See col. 8, lines 47 and Fig. 2.

Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson (5727155) in view of Braden Harder et al. (USPN 5933822) and Ostrovsky (USPN 6226640).

Dawson in view of Braden has been described above. However, Dawson does not teach a sequence of activations and building a query from the sequence of activations. Ostrovsky on the other hand teaches a database (120) in which a memory (210) comprises a data storage (220) and a query processor (215), which includes instructions in the form of software that a processor (200) executes. See col. 4, lines 38-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dawson's computer system to adapt Ostrovsky's query processor (215) including the software. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion in Ostrovsky that the query processor (215) as configured in Fig. 2 equivalently provides the desired formation of a query from a sequence of activations. The use of a query processor (215) helps function a programmable inquiring processor (100), which can be any computer, as taught by Ostrovsky.

Regarding claim 33, Braden teaches a user entering a query (201) to the browser. See Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 34, Braden teaches query generation (Fig. 9B) along with a processor (940), which distributes messages. See Fig. 9D and col. 19, lines 31-35.

Regarding claim 35, Braden teaches application programs (400) that execute within a computer (300). See Fig. (3-4).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abduselam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2674

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

January 9, 2003



RICHARD HORNE
SUPERVISOR
JAN 10 2003